

**REMARKS**

In light of the remarks to follow reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because reference signs mentioned in the specification did not match reference signs in the drawings. The specification has been amended herein and as such, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-42 are in this application.

Claims 1-6, 9-24, 26-31, and 34-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,607).

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

“superimposing information indicative of a start of and information indicative of an end of a portion of each piece of information content... as electronic watermark information...”  
(Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner appears to rely on the abstract, col. 4, lines 14-67, and col. 5 to col. 6, line 60 of Davis. Furthermore, the Examiner specifically relied on col. 6, lines 16-27 and stated that such portion “refers to time content that means an [sic] start and an ending to the time of the content. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Davis as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Davis”) do not disclose the above-described feature of claim 1. That is, Davis, and in particular, col. 6, lines 16-27, mentions locating watermarks in a temporal portion, spatial portion, or different transform domains in order to embed a variety of different information, instructions, and links into media signals. Davis does not appear to specifically teach superimposing information indicative of a start and an end information as electronic watermark information.

Further, independent claim 1 also recites in part as follows:

“...**determining completion of copying** of said each piece of information content when both of said information indicative of the start of and said information indicative of the end of said copyrighted portion are detected...” (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that Davis does not appear to teach “determining completion of copying...” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for the reasons described above, independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Davis.

For reasons substantially similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 4, 11, 16, 21, 23, 27, 30, 36, and 40 are also believed to be distinguishable from Davis.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 20, 12-15, 17-20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 37-39, 41, and 42 depend from one of the independent claims and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Davis for at least the reasons previously described


Claims 7, 8, 25, 32, and 33 were objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claims 4, 23, and 30 are believed to be distinguishable from Davis, claims 7, 8, 25, 32, and 33 have not been rewritten herein.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800